

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAYMOND ALFORD BRADFORD,

No. 2:21-cv-02374-WBS-CKD

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

HOWARD E. MOSELEY, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On January 14, 2022, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis.

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 2 1. The findings and recommendations filed January 14, 2022, are adopted in full.
3 2. Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is denied.
4 3. Plaintiff is granted fourteen days from the date this Order is filed in which to pay the
5 \$402 filing fee for this action. Failure to pay the filing fee within the time permitted will result in
6 the dismissal of this action without prejudice.

7 Dated: February 14, 2022



8 **WILLIAM B. SHUBB**
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 12/brad2374.800.docx

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28